PTO/SB/21 (09-04) Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031

October 21, 2005

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

**TRANSMITTAL FORM** 

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.

Sharon E. Byam

Signature ·

Typed or printed name

**Application Number** 10/665,628 Filing Date September 22, 2003 First Named Inventor Anthony W. James **Art Unit** 2643 **Examiner Name** Melur Ramakrishnaiah FOLIND ODEA

Total Number of Pages in This Submiss	ion 2	Attorney Docket N	umber	FOUND-0054					
ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)									
Fee Transmittal Form	Drawing(s)			After Allowance Communication to TC					
. Fee Attached	Licensing-related Papers			Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences					
Amendment / Reply	Petition	•		Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)					
After Final	Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application			Proprietary Information					
Affidavits/declaration(s)	Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address			Status Letter					
Extension of Time Request	Terminal Disclaimer			Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):					
Express Abandonment Request	Request for Refund CD, Number of CD(s)			Applicant/Attorney Interview Summary (Supplemental); return postcard					
☐ Information Disclosure Statement	☐ Lan	dscape Table on CD							
Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)	Remarks								
Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application									
Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR1.52 or 1.53	·								
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT									
Firm	THELENAREID & PRIEST LLP								
Signature	MhmlfmM								
Printed Name	Marc S. Hanish								
Date	October 21, 200	95	Reg. No.	42,626					
CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING									

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450,



## Applicant/Attorney Interview Summary

Application No.: 10/665,628 First Named Applicant: Anthony W. James								
Examiner: Melur Ramakrishnaiah Art Unit: 2643 Status of Application: Pending								
Participants: (1) Examiner Melur Ramakrishnaiah (2) Marc S. Hanish, Reg. No. 42,626								
(3)(4)								
Date of Interview: October 21, 2005 Time: 11:00 a.m.								
Type of Interview: (a) [X] Telephonic	(b) [ ] Personal	(c) [] Video Conference						
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: [] YES [X] NO If yes, provide brief description:								
Issues Claims/ (Rej., Obj., etc) Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed				
(1) <u>Claims 1-45</u> (2) (3) (4)		[X] [] []	[] [] []	[X] [] []				
[] Continuation Sheet Attached [] Copy of Draft Amendment (attached)  Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:								
Applicant pointed out the fact that there was no support in Cavency given for the limitation "in response to the detecting and the authenticating. The Examiner indicated he felt this was obvious and inherent. No agreement was reached as to the claims.								
Note: The MPEP, section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record  A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the Examiner was reached at the interview.								
In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an Examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed be the Applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)								
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature) (FOUND-0054)								